



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,337	08/08/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10007652-1	1943
7590 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER	
			DIVECHA, KAMAL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/923,337	SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner KAMAL B. DIVECHA	Art Unit 2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office is in response to communications filed 5/30/08.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed on 5/30/08 in this application **after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences** (See BPAI Decision 3/31/08: Examiner Affirmed), but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/30/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by the substantial amendments.

In the submission, applicant argues in substance that:

- a. Li mentions nothing of:
 - Discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of a converted content

- Selecting, based **on one or more** of the obtained style sheet and the discerned format, an imaging conversion program from a plurality of image conversion programs for use in converting the obtained content; or
- Performing one or more of a filtering of the obtained content, a labeling of the obtained content, and a reordering of the obtained content as specified by the obtained style sheet (**moot in view of new grounds of rejection**).

The limitations “Discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of a converted content” is similar to previously presented “determining a desired format for a desired destination for the content” and “the selecting” is similar to previously presented selecting an imaging conversion program from plural programs based on the style sheet and the desired format.

As set forth in the Examiner’s Answer 12/19/06, e.g. pg. 24-26, Li clearly discloses discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of a converted content, i.e. desired and/or target destination, and selecting the conversion program from plural programs based on at least desired format as follows:

In Li, a template defines how to transform one data format into another (Li, Abstract).

Li teaches the process of receiving a document transformation request, wherein the request includes a document to be transformed or an address or identifier of such a document, and a template to be used in the transformation of the document. The identification of the template may comprise one or more keyword/value pairs, which may be used to select the template. Or, recognition logic may be used to examine the document in order to select a template to be used in the transformation (Li, [0018]).

The templates may be specified using the style sheets, or using software programs, or using other approaches (Li, [0022]). In other words, the templates are software programs that transform one data format into another data format, i.e. conversion programs (Li, pg. 7 [0064], pg. 10, claim 16).

Li teaches the process of selecting and applying the template when the criteria are met (note that the templates define one or more transformations, which are performed on the documents) (Li, pg. 6 [0057]).

Consider the following paragraphs of Li: (page 7 and page 8)

[0058] As an alternative to use of style sheets for templates, a stand-alone program or utility may be invoked to perform transformation from one data format to another.

[0059] Developing style sheets and other forms of transformation logic specifications requires special skills, and this function may also be offloaded from the business partners to a professional third party service such as the entity which offers the web transformation services. Professional transformation template creation services may be offered where business partners may contract for template development (and optionally registration) of templates that will perform transformations between their various data formats. The techniques of the present invention enable application developers at the business partners to be shielded from knowing and accounting for each other's data formats. FIG. 5, for example, depicts company A producing a file for representing various company B and company C. Professionals at the template creation service may develop transformation templates that translate from A's formats to B's formats, and from A's formats to C's formats (and, typically, for reverse transformations of data received from company A). When sending an outbound document to the web transformation services at run-time, company A preferably also provides an identifier of the target company which allows automatically selecting the correct transformation template. (As an alternative to supplying an identifier of the target company, in some cases other criteria may be used for this purpose. The optimal way to select a transformation template will depend on the particular implementation of the present invention and the characteristics of its customers and their data. The template registration and selection approach described herein enables a flexible and generic solution to be used, as will be described with reference to FIGS. 5 and 7.)

[0060] Note that templates which have been registered by or on behalf of one company may in some cases be used for transforming documents received from other companies. Permissions or access rights may be used, if desired, to limit sharing of templates. Techniques for controlling access to stored information in this manner are well known in the art, and will not be described further herein.

[0061] Logic which may be used to implement preferred embodiments of the web transformation services will now be described with reference to FIGS. 8-10.

[0062] In FIG. 8, logic which may be used to implement a registration service for transformation templates is depicted. The registration process begins at Block 500 by receiving template registration information from a requester. Preferably, this information comprises a template (or, alternatively, an address or other identifier which may be used to locate a template) and a requester identifier ("ID"), and recognition logic (or a specification of selection criteria) which may be used to determine when this template should be used. The recognition logic or selection criteria may alternatively be omitted, as the selection criteria may be contained within the template itself. For example, style sheet rules within a template may be evaluated to determine whether any of the actions specified in the style sheet are applicable. (Note that a template may also be explicitly identified on a transformation request, as shown in FIG. 7, in which case the template may be considered as implicitly registered and the use of recognition logic is therefore not required.)

Art Unit: 2151

alternatively, an address or reference which enables locating the document), the requester's ID, and one of (i) a template to use in the transformation, (ii) a registration handle or other identifier of a previously-stored template, or (iii) parameter values for matching against previously-stored recognition logic to select a stored template. The optional requester information is validated (Block 710), and if invalid, an error message or code is preferably returned (Block 720) to the requester. Otherwise, when the requester passes the validation, Block 730 checks to see if a registration handle was passed as input. If so, then this handle is used to select and retrieve a pre-compiled template from the transformation cache (Block 740), and processing continues to Block 770. When a registration handle was not passed, Block 750 checks to see if values to use with recognition logic were passed. If so, then these values are used to retrieve a stored template (Block 760); otherwise, the depicted logic assumes that a template was passed, and control transfers directly to Block 770 to apply this template. (If desired, an additional test may be implemented when Block 750 has a negative result to determine whether a template was in fact passed, and if not, an error message may be generated and returned to the requester.)

[0068] As an example of using values with recognition logic, a parameter value might be passed on the transformation service request which identifies a target recipient of the document to be transformed. If a template has been registered which uses company identifier as a selection criterion, and if this passed parameter value matches one of the values which may have been specified as an appropriate value for the company identifier during the registration process, then this template may be selected. Selection criteria and/or values may be used to organize stored templates for efficient retrieval, if desired. Such organization techniques will be obvious to one of skill in the art, and do not form part of the inventive concepts of the present invention.

Paragraph [0059] expressly discloses the method which enable application developers at the business partner to be shielded from knowing and accounting for each other's data formats. For example, suppose company A produces data for interoperating with company B and company C. Professionals at the template creation service may develop transformation templates that translate from A's format to B's format, and from A's format to C's format (and, typically, for reverse transformations of data destined for company A). When sending an outbound document to the web transformation services at run-time, **company A preferably also provides an identifier of the target company which allows automatically selecting the correct transformation template, i.e. a conversion program**, at least based on the desired format,

wherein the desired format is identified through the target company's identifier, i.e. discerning a format utilizing information such as identifier of the target destination.

Paragraph [0068] in conjunction with figure 10 further indicates the process of identifying a target recipient of the document to be transformed, and if the template has been registered which uses company identifier as a selection criteria...then this template may be selected...for transformation.

Also note that "the desired destination of converted content" in the present claims can be expressed as an identifier.

In other words, discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of converted content is merely determining a format utilizing information from the identifier of the target destination.

The registration process in Li registers the appropriate templates, i.e. template needed in order to transform the format of company A to format of company B, and when the request for transformation service is received, the transformation system identifies the target format, i.e. desired format, by identifying the target recipient of the document and selects the appropriate template, i.e. conversion program based on the required format of the destination.

Therefore, Li does teach the process of receiving the content to be transformed, determining the desired format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of converted content and selecting the template, i.e. a conversion program, based at least on the desired format in order to transform the received document into the desired format or the format utilized by the destination.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: computer readable medium as in claim 20.

For examination purposes, the medium is strictly interpreted as computer readable storage medium. E.g. CD-ROM.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 19-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims recite the term “and/or”. The term and/or can be interpreted as “and” OR “or”.

For examination purposes the term is interpreted as “or”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 19 recites:

A system for providing imaging conversion services on content, comprising:
a component for receiving a communication identifying content to be converted and a style sheet;
a component for...
a component for...
a component for...
a component for...

Initially, the claim fails to fall into any of the four enumerated category of the patentable statutory subject matter as set forth above.

Although the claim recites the term “system”, the claim actually lacks the necessary physical articles/objects/elements/components to constitute a machine, system or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter.

As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

[Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make the claim statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract

ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer”.)

See MPEP 2106.01.

As evidenced by the specification, the present invention can be implemented via program codes, e.g. pg. 4 [0022], pg. 7 [0043]: server is program. In other words, the components can be implemented via program codes resulting in software *per se*.

Hence, the claim fails to place the claimed invention squarely within one statutory class of invention as set forth above.

Claim 22 is rejected due to its dependency on claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 17-23 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Li (Pub. No.: US 2004/0205613) in view of Boag et al. (hereinafter Boag, US 6,589,291 B1).

As per claim 1, Li discloses a method for providing imaging conversion services on content (See pg. 7 [0067] to pg. 8 [0070]), comprising the steps of:

receiving a communication identifying content to be converted and a style sheet (pg. 4 [0041], pg. 7-8 [0065-0067]: document identifier and style sheet, pg. 8 [0068]);

obtaining the content and style sheet identified by the communication (pg. 4 [0041], pg. 7 [0065]: retrieving style sheet, pg. 7 [0067], pg. 8 [0074]: retrieving content);

discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of converted content (pg. 7 [0059], pg. 8 [0068]: determining format through identifier);

selecting, based on **one or more of the** obtained style sheet and the discerned format, an imaging conversion program from a plurality of imaging conversion programs for use in converting the obtained content (pg. 2 [0016], [0018], [0022], pg. 3 [0033], [0038], pg. 4 [0040]-[0041], pg. 5 [0049], pg. 7 [0059]);

converting the content using the selected imaging conversion program (pg. 7 [0067] to pg. 8 [0070]: transforming content through selected template); and

transmitting the converted content to a desired destination (pg. 8 [0070], pg. 9 [0077]).

However, Li does not disclose the process of performing **one or more of** a filtering of the obtained content, a labeling of the obtained content and a reordering of the obtained content as specified by the obtained style sheet.

Boag explicitly discloses the process of receiving a request for content, obtaining a style sheet and performing, at the server, **one or more of a filtering**, a labeling and a reordering of the obtained content as specified by the obtained content (fig. 3 item #310, 315, col. 2 L20-67, col. 3 L58-65, col. 7 L57 to col. 8 L67, col. 9 L19 to col. 10 L38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li in view of Boang in order to filter the content and convert the filtered content.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have reduced content and/or it would have enabled the applicability of style sheets to be increased (Boang: col. 9 L50-62, col. 10 L26-37).

As per claim 2, Li discloses the method wherein the acts of receiving, obtaining, discerning, selecting, performing, converting and transmitting are performed by a web service at a web site identified by a URL reference selected to instigate the received communication (pg. 6 [0054], 54 and fig. 2; Boang: col. 9 L50-67).

As per claim 3, Li discloses the method wherein the content is obtained from a source web site that is different from the web service web site (pg. 2 [0018], fig. 3 item #310, pg. 4 [0041], pg. 3 [0033-0034]); and wherein the obtaining a style sheet step comprises receiving a style sheet from the source web site (pg. 2 [0018], pg. 7 [0066]: network accessible style sheet).

As per claim 4, Li discloses the method wherein the content is obtained from a source web site that is different from the web service web site (pg. 2 [0018], fig. 3 item #310, pg. 4 [0041], pg. 3 [0033-0034]); and wherein the obtaining a style sheet step comprises selecting a default style sheet (pg. 4 [0041], pg. 9 [0076]).

As per claim 6, Li discloses the method wherein the criterion for the selecting a conversion program step selects a conversion program dynamically based on a negotiation taking place between the web service and a requestor and based on capabilities of each (pg. 4 [0040-0041], pg. 7 [0059-0060]; selecting template based on formats, pg. 7-8 [0067-0068], pg. 9 [0075]; dynamically select the template).

As per claim 7, Li discloses the method wherein the transmitting step comprises the step of transmitting the converted content to a consuming web site or service (pg. 4 [0045], pg. 9 [0077]).

As per claim 8, Li discloses the method wherein the transmitting step comprises transmitting the converted content to storage in a personal imaging repository (pg. 4 [0042], pg. 9 [0077]).

As per claim 9, Li discloses the method wherein the transmitting step comprises transmitting a reference to the converted content, with the reference referring to the converted content (pg. 4 [0041], pg. 9 [0077]).

As per claim 10, Li discloses the method wherein the selecting an imaging conversion step comprises associating a reference for the selected imaging conversion program to the content or to a reference for the content and making that content or the content reference accessible to a user, to thereby permit the converting step to be performed on a demand basis (pg. 2 [0016-0018], [0024], pg. 4 [0041], pg. 7 [0065], pg. 8 [0068]).

As per claim 11, Li discloses the method wherein the obtaining content step comprises obtaining a reference to the content and associating the content reference to a reference for the web service method and making this content reference accessible to a user, so that the conversion services may be performed on a demand basis (pg. 1 [0014], pg. 3 [0033], [0036-0037], fig. 3: transformation services intermediary).

As per claim 12, Li discloses the method wherein the converted content is stored on the web service (pg. 4 [0042], pg. 9 [0077]).

As per claim 13, Li does not disclose the process wherein the performing a filtering step comprises filtering the content to delete selected items therein according to the style sheet.

Boag explicitly discloses the process of filtering the content to delete selected items according to style sheet (fig. 3 item #310, 315, col. 2 L20-67, col. 3 L58-65, col. 7 L57 to col. 8 L67, col. 9 L19 to col. 10 L38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li in view of Boag in order to delete the selected items according to style sheet.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 17, Li discloses the method wherein said obtaining a style sheet step comprises allowing a user to configure a style sheet for use with the method (pg. 4 [0040]).

As per claim 18, Li discloses the method wherein the transmitting step comprises transmitting the content to another service (pg. 4 [0045], pg. 9 [0077]: i.e. business partner or user).

As per claim 21, Li discloses the method wherein the converted content comprises an image (pg. 3 [0034]).

As per claims 19-20 and 22-23, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1-4, 6-13, 17-18 and 21. Therefore, claims 19-20 and 22-23 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-4, 6-13, 17-18 and 21.

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (Pub. No.: US 2004/0205613) in view of Boag et al. (hereinafter Boag, US 6,589,291 B1), and further in view of Todaka (U. S. Patent No. 6,785,022).

As per claim 5, Li in view of Boag discloses the method as in claim 1 as set forth above.

However, Li and Boag do not disclose the process wherein the desired destination is a printer having a parameter and wherein the desired format for the printer is related to that parameter.

Todaka discloses the process of converting a document to make it compatible with a printer (i.e. it converts the document in order to enable the printer to print the document, col. 4, lines 25-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li and Boag in view of Todaka in order to print the document in a printer compatible format.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled the process of converting documents in order to make them compatible with a printer (Todaka: col. 4, lines 25-26).

4. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (Pub. No.: US 2004/0205613) in view of Boag et al. (hereinafter Boag, US 6,589,291 B1), and further in view of Alan Houser (hereinafter Houser, "Using Style Sheets to Publish XML to the Web").

As per claim 14, Li in view of Boag discloses the method as in claim 1 as set forth above.

However, Li in view of Boag does not disclose the process wherein the performing a filtering step comprises labeling different items in the content according to the style sheet.

Houser discloses the process of labeling different items in the content according to the style sheet (pg. 4: Using XSLT Style sheets).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li and Boag in view of Houser in order to label different items in the content.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because these capabilities would have provided a powerful mechanism, not only for customizing the publishing of documents, but for transforming documents that can be displayed by any web browser (Houser, pg. 4).

As per claim 15, Li and Boag do not disclose wherein the performing a reordering step comprises the process of reordering labeled content.

Houser explicitly discloses the process of reordering labeled content (pg. 4 L35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Houser as stated above with Li and Boag in order to reorder labeled content.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 14 above.

As per claim 16, Li and Boag do not disclose the process wherein the performing a reordering step comprises the process of changing a layout of the content on a page.

Houser explicitly discloses the process of changing a layout of the content on a page (pg. 4 L35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Houser as stated above with Li and Boag in order to change a layout of the content on a page.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 14 above.

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- b. Fletcher et al., US 6,138,156: Selecting and Applying content-reducing filters based on dynamic environmental factors.
- c. Lonnroth et al., US 6,826,597: providing clients with services that retrieve data from data sources that do not necessarily support the format required by the clients.
- d. Kimoto, US 6,792,577 B1: Data distribution method and apparatus.
- e. Yalcinalp, US 6,507,857: Extending the capabilites of an XSL style sheet to include components for content transformation.
- f. Alam et al., US 6,336,124 B1: Conversion data representing a document to other formats for manipulation and display.

g. Aua et al., US 2002/0069296 A1: Internet Content reformatting apparatus.

Conclusion

Examiner's Remarks: The teachings of the prior art should not be restricted and/or limited to the citations by columns and line numbers, as specified in the rejection. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

In the case of amendments, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and support, for ascertaining the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is (571)272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151
/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151